



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CONFUSION OF THE INDIRECT QUESTION AND THE RELATIVE CLAUSE IN LATIN

BY A. F. BRÄUNLICH

It has often been observed that the indirect question and the relative clause are sometimes indistinguishable in Latin.¹ Examples like Plautus *Amph.* 133, "Quae illi ad legionem facta sunt memorat pater Meus Alcumenae," are common enough in the Latin of all periods. In these examples it is a matter of indifference whether the dependent clauses be regarded as indirect questions or as determinative relative clauses.² It is not so generally recognized that the indirect question and the relative clause were sometimes actually confused. Yet instances of such confusion do occur in the writings that have come down to us. See, for example, Cicero *Phil.* ii. 21. 50: "Accipite nunc, quaeso, non ea quae ipse in se atque in domesticum decus impure et intemperanter, sed quae in nos fortunasque nostras, id est in universam rem publicam, impie ac nefarie fecerit." "Ea quae fecerit" is apparently a contamination of "ea quae fecit" (determinative relative clause) and "quae fecerit" (indirect question).

Such examples, though not numerous, are interesting in their bearing upon text-criticism. Because of failure to recognize this kind of confusion, "emendations" have sometimes been suggested or actually adopted. So for the passage just cited Campe proposed a change of *fecerit* to *fecit*. "Ich bin der Ansicht," he declares, "dass man sich in diesen Dingen ein Herz fassen sollte."³ Of *Verres Actio* II, iii. 40. 92 (cited p. 63) C. F. W. Mueller remarks: "Miror nemini in mentem venisse sic corrigere: Audite litteras quas misit"; and of *Phil.* xiv. 3. 9 (cited p. 71) he says that

¹ Cf., e.g., Kroll, "Der lateinische Relativsatz," *Glotta*, III (1910-12), p. 5.

² The determinative clause is "the clause which points out *what* person or thing is meant." Cf. Hale, *The Cum-Constructions* (Ithaca, New York, 1887), p. 85, German translation (Leipzig, 1891), p. 94; Hale-Buck, *Latin Grammar* (Boston, 1903), p. 260, n. 1, and p. 294, n. 1.

³ "Zu Cicero," *Philologus*, X (1885), p. 631.

Ernesti changes *eaque* to *atque* "recte ut videtur."¹ In *De Div.* i. 38. 82 (cited p. 70) Mueller reads *sunt* in place of *sint*. "Nirgends," he says, "kann ein abhängiger Satz, der halb nach einer Frage, halb nach einem Relativsatz aussieht, unzweideutig zum ertsen gemacht werden, indem man ein *vorhergehendes* einfaches Pron. dem., auf welches sich das Relativum bezöge, streicht. Man sagt nicht *id quod* oder *id quid gestum sit scio*, wenn nicht etwa bei dem letzten Beispiel *id* so viel sein soll wie *tantum*, also im Plural: *id scio, quae gesta sint*."²

Although the confusion of the indirect question and the relative clause has been noticed by a number of scholars,³ the examples have never been collected. In the hope that such a collection might have some influence toward establishing a more conservative attitude toward our Latin texts, I have brought together all the instances that I could find.⁴ The collection does not pretend to be complete. Doubtless a prolonged search, through manuscripts as well as editions, would reveal more instances. The collection includes clear examples of confusion and also examples in which the use of the subjunctive mood may possibly be otherwise accounted for. The various possibilities of interpretation are mentioned. Manuscript variations that are given in the standard editions are reported.

¹ Critical note on Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 34. 95 (ed. of Cicero's works [1893-98], Part II, Vol. I, p. 62, line 8).

² Review of Baiter-Halm, *N.J. für Phil. u. Paed.*, LXXXIX (1864), p. 629.

³ By Hofmann-Andresen, "Ausgewählte Briefe" of Cicero (2d ed., 1885), on *Fam.* xi. 28. 2; Bonnet, *Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours* (Paris, 1890), p. 676, n. 3; Kraner-Dittenberger, ed. Caesar, *Bellum Gallicum* (1890), on vii. 3. 3; Sargeant, ed. *Phormio* (1914), on vs. 845.

Kroll, *op. cit.*, pp. 4 ff., suggests that *Trin.* 373, "Scin tu illum quo genere gnatus sit," may show confusion of the indirect question and the relative clause. He thinks that the sentence arose by contamination of "Scin tu illum (:) quo genere gnatus est?" and "Scin tu quo ille genere gnatus sit?" and remarks: "Hier mag der erstere Typus frühzeitig als Relativsatz empfunden sein, wenn er es auch ursprünglich nicht war" (p. 5). I see no reason for regarding *Trin.* 373 as anything else than an indirect question with prolepsis (for prolepsis see below, p. 64, n. 1). Furthermore, in Kroll's imaginary example with the indicative mood, "quo . . . est" would never, it seems to me, be felt as a relative clause. *Quo genere* cannot refer to *illum* as an antecedent; and to supply *eo genere* would not be natural.

⁴ Some of the examples are taken from Mueller's review of Baiter-Halm (see above, n. 2) and cross-references in the critical notes of Mueller's edition of Cicero; Hofmann-Andresen on *Fam.* xi. 28. 2; Fügner, *Lexicon Livianum* (Leipzig, 1897), s.v. *audio*; Schmalz, *Lateinische Syntax* (4th ed., Munich, 1910), p. 658. The rest have been gathered in the course of my own reading of Latin authors.

EXAMPLES

CLASS I. THE ANTECEDENT IS A PRONOUN

Cic. *Phil.* ii. 21. 50:

Accipite nunc, quaeso, non ea quae ipse in se atque in domesticum decus impure et intemperanter, sed quae in nos fortunasque nostras, id est in universam rem publicam, impie ac nefarie fecerit.

Cic. *Rep.* i. 13. 19:

Ain vero, Phile, iam explorata nobis sunt ea quae ad domos nostras quaeque ad rem publicam pertineant? Siquidem, quid agatur in caelo quaerimus.

pertinent m. I, and most editors (but not Mueller). Skutsch, in *Glotta*, III (1912), thinks that the rhythm proves that the indicative is right. But see below, p. 73.

Cic. *De. Orat.* ii. 39. 166:

Et causas rerum vestigabimus, et ea quae ex causa orta sint, et maiora paria minora quaeremus.

sunt L.

A little later, in 40. 171, this passage is picked up in the words: "Ex iis autem quae sunt orta de causis." In the latter passage there is no possibility of confusion with the indirect question; and the indicative, the regular mood of the determinative clause of fact, is employed.

Cic. *Fam.* iii. 10. 11:

Nunc ea quae a me profecta quaeque instituta sint, cognosce.

sint M, Mendelssohn, Mueller; *sunt* G R, Baiter, Wesenbach, Tyrrell-Purser (1890).

Caelius in Cic. *Fam.* viii. 13. 1:

Non est enim pugna in vitiis neque hebes ad id quod melius sit intellegendum.

melius sit M H³, Mueller; *est* Wesenbach, Tyrrell-Purser. The Tyrrell-Purser edition (1890) comments: "The ordinary reading, *melius sit*, probably arose from *meliust*; no account can be given of the subjunctive."

Author of Varro *R.R.* Capitula Libri Primi (Goetz, p. 3):

De eis quae extra fundum comoda fiant aut incommoda.

fiant V B; *funt* A, Victorinus, Goetz.

Author of Varro *R.R. Capitula Libri Primi* (Goetz, p. 4):

De eis quae seri oporteat et quare legumina appellantur.

appellantur A.

In all of the foregoing passages the natural meaning of *ea quae* or *id quod* is "the things which" or "that which" (determinative). To account for the subjunctive by interpreting "things which" or "a thing which" (descriptive¹) would be forced. Similarly in the examples of Classes II and III, given below, to interpret the dependent clauses as descriptive is either impossible or unnatural.

CLASS II. THE ANTECEDENT IS A NOUN

A. *Antecedent and pronoun are both objects:*

Cic. *Verr. Act.* II, iii. 40. 92:

Audite litteras quas ad Segestanos miserit. Litterae C. Verris.

Cic. *Leg. Manil.* 13. 38:

Itinera quae per hosce annos in Italia per agros atque oppida civium Romanorum nostri imperatores fecerint, recordamini.

B. *Antecedent an object; pronoun a subject:*

Cic. *Leg. Agr.* I. 8. 25:

Cum vero scelera consiliorum vestrorum fraudemque legis et insidias, quae ipsi populo Romano a popularibus tribunis plebis fiant, ostendero, pertimescam, credo, ne mihi non liceat contra vos in contione consistere.

C. *Antecedent an object; pronoun neither subject nor object:*

Ter. *Adel.* 572:

At nomen nescio

Illius hominis, sed locum novi ubi sit.

The first two examples of Class II have sometimes been understood as indirect questions with an unusual word-order. Thus Richter (ed. 1871) and Deuerling (ed. 1884) explain the order in *Leg. Manil.* as emphatic. Sure examples of indirect questions with such word-order occur in Plautus: *Bacch.* 891, "Iam dudum herele equidem sentio suspicio Quae te sollicitet"; *Aul.* 778; *Curc.* 321. There seems to be no sure example in Cicero. Commentators on our

¹ For the descriptive clause of fact, with the subjunctive mood, cf. Hale, *Cum-Constructions*, pp. 88 ff., German translation, pp. 98 ff.; Hale-Buck, *Latin Grammar*, § 521, 1.

Leg. Manil. passage refer to *Leg. Manil.* 2. 6, "Causa quae sit videtis." However, this passage is not parallel. In "Causa quae sit," *causa* is the subject, and *quae* is in the predicate. In the present passages, *quae* and *quas* would modify the nouns. Mueller finds the *Verres* passage difficult, as is shown by his suggested emendation (cf. p. 60).

All the passages of Class II might conceivably be explained as indirect questions with prolepsis or pleonasm.¹ In B the subject of the indirect question would be "anticipated" as the object of the main verb. (Cf., as a typical instance of prolepsis, *Men.* 519, "Uxori rem omnem iam ut sit gesta eloquar.") In A there would be an unusual (and, so far as I know, unrecognized²) sort of prolepsis. Not the subject, but the object, of the indirect question would be anticipated. *Leg. Manil.* would be interpreted: "Remember the marches, viz., what marches our generals have made." In C Ter. *Adel.* may conceivably be an indirect question with pleonasm.³ *Locum*, that is, may pleonastically express the idea of place which is contained in *ubi sit*. The interpretation would be, "I know the place, viz., where he is." Still, especially for A and C, it seems over-subtle to speak of prolepsis or pleonasm. The difference in feeling between "Itinera, quae . . . fecerint," for example, and "Itinera quae . . . fecerunt" must have been, at the most, extremely slight. If there is not, in these examples, actual confusion between indirect question and relative clause, at any rate the indirect question approaches suspiciously near to the function of the relative clause.

ADDITIONAL POSSIBLE EXAMPLES OF CLASS II

In the following examples, more easily than in the preceding ones, the dependent clauses may be understood as indirect questions, with prolepsis or pleonasm. However, these examples, too, *may* show confusion of the indirect question and the relative clause.

¹ For pleonasm and prolepsis, cf. Lindskog, *Quaestiones de Parataxi et Hypotaxi apud Priscos Latinos* (Lund, 1896), pp. 69 ff. and 75 ff.

² Tincani, in his edition of *Leg. Manil.* (1889), comments on our passage from this oration: "detto per prolessi." However, as he cites 2. 6, "Causa quae sit," as parallel, he seems not to use "prolessi" in the sense in which "prolepsis" is generally employed.

³ Lindskog, *op. cit.*, p. 83, cites this passage as an example of *prolepsis*, although on p. 75 he defines prolepsis as the structure "*ubi subiectus enuntiati secundarii pro obiecto primarii ponitur*" (the italics are mine).

(A).

Varro *R.R.* iii. 1. 10:

Haec ad te misi, recordatus de ea re sermones, quos de villa perfecta habuissimus.

This passage differs from the preceding passages in that the repetition of *de ea re*, in the form *de villa perfecta*, makes it less inevitable to understand the dependent clause as relative. This awkward repetition may well cause the hearer to keep his mind in suspense until he hears the subjunctive *habuissimus*.

(C).

Cic. *Pro Flacco* 33. 81:

Habetis causam inimicitiarum, qua causa inflammatum Decianum ad Laelium detulerit hanc optimam accusationem.

Here the presence of *qua causa*, after *inimicitiarum*, has much the same effect as *de villa perfecta* had after *de ea re* in the preceding example. *Inimicitiarum* may seem to the hearer to define *causas* adequately, so that the *qua causa* clause comes as a surprise and causes him to hold his mind open until he hears the subjunctive.

(B).

Ter. *Hec.* 351:

Omnem rem narrabit, scio, continuo sola soli,
Quae inter vos intervenerit, unde ortumst initium irae.

(D). *Antecedent in a prepositional phrase; pronoun a subject:*Cic. *Ad Quint. Fratr.* i. 2. 16:

De singulis tamen rebus, quae cotidie gerantur, faciam te crebro certiore.

In the last two passages the modifiers *omnem* and *singulis* affect the interpretation in much the same way (though to a less extent) as did the modifiers mentioned in the two preceding passages. Their presence makes it somewhat easier than it would otherwise be to regard the dependent clauses as interrogative. If the clauses are so interpreted, there will be an unusual, though not unnatural, sort of prolepsis in *Quint. Fratr.* The subject of the indirect question will be anticipated, not as the object of the introductory verb (as in the usual kind of prolepsis), but as the principal word of a phrase: "I shall keep you informed of all events: what events occur every day."

(C).

Plaut. *Most.* 969:

Scio qua me eire oportet et quo uenerim noui locum.

loqui P; "Pro loci?" Lindsay. This passage differs from *Adel.* 572, cited above, in that the dependent clause precedes the noun with which it is connected. On this account it seems a little easier to regard the dependent clause in the present passage as interrogative than it was in the case of the *Adel.* example.

CLASS III. THE ANTECEDENT IS NOT EXPRESSED OR ELSE IS WITHIN THE
DEPENDENT CLAUSE

Cic. *Inv.* ii. 9. 30:

Quae res harum aliquam rem consequantur, faciles cognitu sunt.

Edd., including Mueller, emend.

Cic. *Lael.* 16. 56:

Constituendi autem sunt qui sint in amicitia fines et quasi termini deligendi.

Matius in Cic. *Fam.* xi. 28. 2:

Nota enim mihi sunt, quae in me post Caesaris mortem contulerint.

Caes. *B.G.* vii. 3. 3:

Nam quae Cenabi oriente sole gesta essent ante primam confectam vigiliam in finibus Arvernorum audita sunt.

Doberenz (ed. 1857) comments: "Der Conjunktiv weil der Gedanke concessiv zu fassen: was doch erst . . . , oder wiewohl es erst." Later editors generally agree. Bond-Walpole (1887) makes an additional comment: "If *quae essent* had been the conjunctive of indirect question, *auditum est* must have stood." This interpretation seems improbable to me. I know of just one edition in which the passage is explained as a confusion of the relative clause and the indirect question—that of Kraner-Dittenberger (1890).

Livy xxi. 21. 1:

Hannibal Sagunto capto Carthaginem novam in hiberna concesserat, ibique auditis quae Romae quaeque Carthagine acta decretaque forent, seque non ducem solum sed etiam causam esse belli, . . . Hispani generis milites convocat.

It should be noted that in this example *auditis* is followed by an indirect statement with the infinitive, as well as by the *quae*-clause.

Livy xliv. 30. 12:

Anicius praetor eo tempore Apolloniae auditis quae in Illyrico gererentur, praemissisque ad Appium litteris, . . . triduo et ipse in castra venit.

Sargeaunt, on *Phormio* 845, remarks that Livy often confuses the relative clause with the indicative and the dependent question with the subjunctive. Neither Kühnast nor Riemann appears to have noticed such confusion. The few examples which I cite are taken from the Fügner lexicon, *s.v. audio*. If this admirable lexicon could have been finished, my collection would be more complete.

Sen. *Epist. Mor.* vi. 1. 4:

Incredibilia sunt quae tulerim, cum me ferre non possim.

Greg. *H.F.* 5. 36:

Sed quae contra sacerdotes egerit, altius repetenda sunt.

In these examples the number and gender of the principal verbs point to the interpretation of the dependent clauses as relative. On the other hand, the mood of the dependent clauses is appropriate to the indirect question and not to the relative clause. The examples appear, therefore, like those of the other two classes, to be mixtures of relative clause and indirect question. Cic. *Inv.*, for example, seems to be a contamination of "Quae res . . . consequuntur faciles cognitu sunt" and "Quae res . . . consequantur, facile cognitu est." It should be noted, however, that there occur in Latin a number (in classical Latin apparently only a small number) of passages in which an impersonal verb in an independent clause is assimilated in number and gender to some word or words in a dependent clause, but in which there is no possibility of confusion of indirect question and relative clause. Cf. Cic. *Leg. Agr.* ii. 37. 102, "Quae nobis designatis timebatis, ea ne accidere possent, consilio meo ac ratione provisum sunt."¹ It may, then, perhaps be doubted whether the occurrence of the examples of our Class III was a result or a cause of confusion of indirect question and relative clause. Because of the contemporary, or possibly earlier, occurrence of examples of our other two classes, the former supposition seems the more probable one.

¹ Cf. Schmalz, *Lateinische Syntax*, p. 658; Hofmann-Andresen on Cic. *Fam.* xi. 28. 2.

ADDITIONAL POSSIBLE EXAMPLES

There are other passages which resemble those quoted but in which the subjunctives may, with varying degrees of probability, be due to indirect discourse, to attraction, or to the influence of an infinitive.

I. INDIRECT DISCOURSE

(Class III)

Cic. *Phil.* vi. 1. 1:

Audita vobis esse arbitor, Quirites, quae sint acta in senatu, quae fuerit cuiusque sententia.

Livy xxix. 21. 1:

Alii, auditis quae Romae acta essent, in exilium Neapolim euntem forte in Q. Metellum, unum ex legatis, incidisse et ab eo Regium vi retractum tradunt.

Ter. *Phorm.* 876:

Sed me censen potuisse omnia

Intellegere extra ostium, intus quae inter sese ipsi egerint?

Sargeaunt considers this passage an example of confusion of indirect question and relative clause. See his note on vs. 845 (cited p. 70).

Cato in *Fronto*, correspondence with M. Antonius i. 2 (near end):

Maiorum bene facta perlecta: deinde quae ego pro republica fecissem leguntur.

(Class II, B)

Plaut. *Rud.* 353:

Am. Ex malis multis metuque summo

Capitalique ex periculo orbas auxiliique opumque huc

Recepit ad se venerea haec sacerdos me et Palaestram.

Tr. . . . Sed istuc periculum perlubet quod fuerit vobis scire.

(Class I)

Plaut. *Trin.* 207:

Quod quisque in animo habet aut habiturust sciunt:

Sciunt id quod in aurem rex reginae dixerit;

Sciunt quod Iuno fabulatast cum Iove;

Quae neque futura neque sunt, tamen illi sciunt.

Some editors change *id quod* to *quid*; so Ritschl (1884) (following Reiz and Hermann) and Freeman and Sloman (1890). Goetz-Schoell (1901) places † before *id*. Brix-Niemeyer, ed. 1888, comments: "Der potentiale Konjunktiv neben den Indikativen wenig wahrscheinlich, man schreibt übrigens gewöhnlich *quid*." In the Brix-Niemeyer ed. of 1907 the comment is: "Einmal im Potentialis 'dixerit,' dann in strikter Behauptung 'fabulatast.'"

Ter. *Adel.* 236:

Iamne enumerasti id quod ad te rediturum putes?

Spengel (1905) and others remark that *rediturum putes* is pleonastic, being equivalent to *rediturum sit*. The use of the subjunctive, however, is not explained.

In the last four examples, if there is indirect discourse, it is of the "informal" kind.¹ The meaning would be, for Cato: "Then the deeds were read which, it was said, I had performed for the state." *Rud.* would mean: "I am very eager to know about the danger which, as you say, you have experienced." The meaning of *Trin.* would be: "They know that which, as they say, the king has whispered into the queen's ear." In *Adel.* 236 the idea of indirectness would be expressed, pleonastically, both by the subjunctive mood and by the verb *putare*.²

In the following example I think it very probable that the subjunctives are due to informal indirect discourse: Cic. *Cato Maior* xxi. 78. "Demonstrabantur mihi praeterea quae Socrates supremo vitae die de immortalitate animorum disseruisset, is qui esset omnium sapientissimus oraculo Apollinis iudicatus." It seems more likely that the mood of both *disseruisset* and *esset* is due to informal indirect discourse, than that "Demonstrabantur . . . quae . . . disseruisset" shows confusion of the indirect question and the relative clause, and that *esset* is attracted into the subjunctive.

¹ For informal indirect discourse, cf. Hale-Buck, *Latin Grammar*, § 535, 1a.

² Cf. the use of *dicere* in the subjunctive in Cic. *Phil.* ii. 3. 7: "Litteras, quas me sibi misisse diceret, recitavit," and *Verr. Act.* II, v. 7. 17: "Nominat iste servum, quem magistrum pecoris esse diceret" (mentioned by Frank, "The Influence of the Infinitive upon Verbs Subordinated to It," *AJP*, XXV [1904], p. 431, note). Similar, and probably more frequent, is the pleonastic use of *existimo* and *dico* in clauses of quoted reason. Cf. Hale-Buck, § 535, 2a.

II. ATTRACTION

(Class I)

Ter. *Phorm.* 845:

Sed ego nunc mihi cesso, qui non umerum hunc onero pallio
Atque hominem propere invenire, ut haec quae contigerint sciat.

This example, because of the position of *contigerint* between *sciat* and *ut*, may very well be an instance of attraction. See Frank, *Attraction of Mood in Early Latin* (Lancaster, Pa., 1904), pp. 36 and 46. Sargeaunt, however, remarks, *ad loc.*: "The confusion between a relative clause with the indicative and a dependent question with the subjunctive is common and natural enough."¹

(Class II, B)

Cic. *De Orat.* ii. 61. 248:

Nunc exponamus genera ipsa summatim quae
risum maxime moveant.

(Class III)

Varro *Sententiae* 137 (Riese, ed. *Saturae*, p. 271):

Non tam quae prosint, quam quae attineant, considerentur.

prosint Paris. 8542; *prosunt* A P.

Livy xxv. 13. 9:

Qui cum auditis quae ad Capuam agerentur, inter se comparassent,
ut alter in Campaniam exercitum duceret, Fulvius . . . Beneventi
moenia est ingressus.

III. INFLUENCE OF AN INFINITIVE

(Class I)

Lucil. 1329:

Virtus est, homini scire id quod quaeque habeat res;
Virtus, scire, homini rectum, utile, quid sit honestum.

Cic. *De Div.* i. 38. 82:

Neque nostra nihil interest scire ea quae eventura sint.

¹ Elmer, in his edition (1895), comments: "The subjunctive is probably due to the influence of *sciat*; but it would be possible in such familiar speech to regard the *quae* as interrogative instead of relative: 'that he may know of all this, viz., what has happened.'" The latter interpretation seems unnatural to me.

sint A V B, Christ, Baiter-Halm; *sunt* H, Mueller. The same passage occurs in ii. 49. 102 (with *futura* in place of *eventura*), where A and V have *sunt*, A² and B *sint*. Christ and Baiter-Halm read *sint*; Mueller *sunt*.

Cic. *De Div.* ii. 51. 105:

At nostra interest scire ea quae eventura sint.

sint codd., Christ, Baiter-Halm; *sunt* Mueller.

Cic. *Phil.* xiv. 3. 9:

Refugit animus, patres conscripti, eaque dicere reformidat quae L. Antonius in Parmensium liberis et coniugibus effecerit.

Cic. *De Orat.* iii. 6. 25:

Sed priusquam illa conor attingere, quibus orationem ornari atque illuminari putem, proponam breviter quid sentiam de universo genere dicendi.

Greg. *Vit. Patr.* xvii (5):

Sed nec hoc silere putavi, quod eidem de regibus Francorum a Domino sit ostensum.

fuit (2. 3).

Greg. *De Virt. S. Iul.* 36 (579. 6):

Sed nec hoc silere puto, quod in nocte illa sit gestum.

(Class II, C)

Vegetius, *Mulom.* iii. 1. 2:

Causas itaque, ex quibus aegritudines generentur, et signa, per quae qualitas earundem possit agnosci, curas etiam, quarum medela sanitas revocetur, per ordinem indicare tentabimus.

The probability that the subjunctive is due to the influence of the infinitive is stronger in some of these examples than in others.¹

¹ According to Frank, "The Influence of the Infinitive upon Verbs Subordinated to It," *AJP*, XXV, pp. 428 ff., this explanation would be more probably correct for *Lucil.* and the *De Div.* passages than for *Phil.* and *De Orat.* The former examples fall into Frank's Group I (see pp. 432, 433, 436 ff.); moreover, the subjunctives are in *generalizing* determinative clauses (p. 444). *De Orat.*, and probably *Phil.*, belong to Frank's Group II (pp. 432 and 438 ff.); besides, the subjunctives are in *particular* (or "precise") determinative clauses, and so, if Frank is right, are not very liable to "attraction" (p. 444).

I do not know what were the habits of Gregory and Vegetius with regard to the use of the subjunctive by "attraction." Bonnet, *Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours*, p. 676, n. 3, mentions the example from *S. Iul.* as showing confusion of relative clause and indirect question. It seems to me that the Vegetius passage also is probably an example of confusion.

However, since "attraction" by the infinitive is of somewhat rare occurrence,¹ there is at least a possibility that the use of the subjunctive in every one of these passages is due to confusion between relative clause and indirect question.

CONFUSION OF THE INDIRECT QUESTION AND THE SUBSTANTIVE QUOD-CLAUSE

Somewhat akin to our examples of the confusion of indirect question and relative clause is the following passage² (Cic. *Att.* vii. 11. 3):

Per fortunas! quale tibi consilium Pompeii videtur? Hoc quaero, quod urbem reliquerit.

Tyrrell-Purser translates: "What I ask you is the meaning of his leaving." No explanation of the mood has ever, to my knowledge, been given. The use of the subjunctive seems to me to be due to confusion with the indirect question. What we have is a contamination of the substantive *quod*-clause of fact, with the indicative, and an indirect question like the one in "Hoc quaero, cur urbem reliquerit" (I ask about this: namely, why he left the city). Or, to put the matter a little differently, the presence of *quaero*, a verb which is often accompanied by an indirect question, gives rise, in this instance, to the illogical use of the mood of the indirect question.

THE INFLUENCE OF METER OR RHYTHM

For those of our passages which occur in poetry or in rhythmical prose writings the question suggests itself, whether the rhythm has any influence upon the mood use. Nine of our examples are in verse.³ Three of these (*Adel.* 236, *Phorm.* 876,⁴ and *Phorm.* 845⁴) could be changed to the indicative without any effect upon the meter. To change the subjunctives in Ter. *Adel.* 572 and Lucil. 1329 to indica-

¹ Cf. Frank, *op. cit.*, p. 446.

² I am indebted to Professor Shipley for this example.

³ Plaut. *Most.* 969, *Rud.* 353, *Trin.* 207; Ter. *Adel.* 572, *Hec.* 351, *Phorm.* 876, *Adel.* 236, *Phorm.* 845; Lucil. 1329.

⁴ For Terence's use of the ending *-erunt* in the third person plural, perfect indicative, see Lindsay, *Latin Language* (Oxford, 1904), p. 532.

tives would introduce hiatus.¹ In the other examples such a change would interfere still more seriously with the meter. It seems, then, as if metrical convenience had sometimes co-operated with the tendency to confuse the indirect question and the relative clause, to bring about the use of the subjunctive.

Of the prose passages only those from Cicero have been considered in this connection. In eleven² of our Cicero passages, the rhythm would be unchanged if the indicative were used; and in one the sentence rhythm would be affected, but not the clausula.³ In two passages, *Leg. Manil.* 13. 38 and *Verr. Act.* II, iii. 40. 92, the subjunctive yields a decidedly better clausula⁴ than the indicative would yield. The *Leg. Manil.* passage is especially interesting, since, as Cicero himself says,⁵ this oration is highly artistic. In one example, *Rep.* i. 13. 19, the subjunctive yields a clausula decidedly inferior to that which the indicative would have afforded.⁶ But this example is in a question; and in questions, Professor Shipley tells me, Cicero is not so partial to the "clausulae verae" as he is in statements. In one passage, *Phil.* xiv. 3. 9, the subjunctive produces a clausula which is *somewhat* less often used than that which the indicative would produce.⁷ Finally, in two passages the subjunctive

¹ There is probably no parallel for such an example of hiatus in either Terence or Lucilius. Cf. Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 209; Marx, ed. Lucilius (1904); *Index Grammaticus Metricus*, s.v. "hiatus."

² The passages are: *De Orat.* ii. 39. 166; *Fam.* iii. 10. 11; *Leg. Agr.* i. 8. 25; *Quint. Fratr.* i. 2. 16; *Inv.* ii. 9. 30; *Lael.* 16. 56; *Phil.* vi. 1. 1; the three passages from *De Div.*; *De orat.* iii. 6. 25.

³ *Pro Flacco* 33. 81.

⁴ In both *Leg. Manil.* and *Verr.* the subjunctive yields - - - | - - -, Zielinski's V28 ("Das Clauselgesetz," *Philologus*, Supplementband IX [1904], 652), one of the "clausulae verae" (*op. cit.* pp. 603 ff.). For the clausula which would result from the use of the indicative (- - - | - - -), see *op. cit.*, pp. 604 ff. and 729 ff. This is one of Zielinski's "clausulae selectae" and is used to produce a heavy effect. Such an effect would not be desirable in our two passages, as the concluding words are not emphatic.

⁵ *Orator* 102. Cf. also Zielinski, *Der constructive Rhythmus in Ciceros Reden* (Leipzig, 1914), p. 68.

⁶ The subjunctive yields one of the "clausulae pessimae" (P. 2). The indicative would have yielded one of the verae (V27, "Clauselgesetz," p. 652).

⁷ The subjunctive gives us L21γ ("Clauselgesetz," p. 658), while the indicative would have given L11γ (p. 620). The former clausula occurs 32 times in the *Philippics* and 119 times in all the orations. The latter occurs 44 times in the *Philippics* and 242 times in all the orations (*loci citati*).

yields clausulae which occur somewhat more often than those which would have resulted from the use of the indicative.¹

It appears, then, that, for the most part, Cicero's feeling for rhythm has nothing to do with the occurrence of the subjunctive in our examples. In a few cases, however, the tendency² to use certain rhythms may have co-operated with the tendency to confuse indirect question and relative clause, to bring about the use of the subjunctive.

CONCLUSIONS

From the passages cited these conclusions are, it seems to me, to be drawn: The indirect question and the relative clause were occasionally confused by Latin authors, and, among the rest, by Cicero. Such confusion is never a just reason for suspecting a manuscript reading. Mueller's theory that clauses lying midway between indirect questions and relative clauses are never used *after* demonstrative pronouns (see p. 61)³ is disproved by the examples of our Class I.

FRANCES SHIMER SCHOOL
MOUNT CARROLL, ILL.

¹ In *Phil.* ii. 21. 50 either the subjunctive or the indicative would yield a "clausula vera." The subjunctive gives us clausula V2δ ("Clauselgesetz," p. 652); the indicative would give us V1δ (p. 615). The former clausula occurs 133 times in the *Philippics* and 666 times in all the orations. The latter clausula occurs 36 times in the *Philippics* and 256 times in all the orations. In *De Orat.* ii. 61. 248 the clausula which the subjunctive gives us is L1³γ (p. 620). The indicative would have given L4δη (p. 710). The former clausula occurs 176 times in the orations; the latter 9 times.

² For the psychology of Cicero's use of rhythm cf. Zielinski, *Der constructive Rhythmus*, pp. 13 ff. Cicero did not, of course, say to himself: "In order to secure a good clausula I will confuse the indirect question and the relative clause." He was not conscious of preferring certain clausulae to others (see *Der constructive Rhythmus*, p. 15), and in all probability he was not conscious of confusing the indirect question and the relative clause. Otherwise, by employing a different word-order—in *Leg. Manil.*, "quae itinera" in place of "itinera quae"—or by making some other easy change, he could have produced the desired rhythmical effect while using a regular indirect question.

³ Mueller made this observation in 1864 (see p. 61, n. 2), but was still influenced by it in his edition of Cicero's works. Cf., e.g., his critical notes on *De Div.* i. 38. 82 and on *Rosc. Am.* 34. 95.